

LINKING RELIEF REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT - ARTICULATING THE COMMISSION'S AID INSTRUMENTS

Intervention of Mr Herman SPITZ - ECHO- Karthoum, June 2006

He made a global presentation of the external aid actors within the EC, their specific role and coordination between working tools.

The strategy to link relief, rehabilitation and development was formally adopted by the European Council in 2001 on the basis of a Communication from the EC.

The 4 players on the LRRD ground, within the EC are:

- DG Humanitarian Aid - ECHO
- DG Development - DEV
- DG External Relations - RELEX
- DG Europe Aid Co-operation - AIDCO

Role of the DG Humanitarian Aid - ECHO :

Provide emergency assistance and relief to the victims of natural disasters or armed conflict outside the European Union, focusing on the most vulnerable populations

The aid is projected to go straight to those in misery, regardless of race, religion or political convictions. ECHO's mission is to make sure those goods (such as vital supplies, crops, medical equipment, medicines and fuel); services (medical and water purification teams, not to mention logistical support) get quickly to crisis zones. ECHO also realizes studies on humanitarian assistance and assesses its impact, trying to improve synchronization not only in the phase of aid but also in the prevention of calamities.

The scope of the humanitarian aid is therefore to ensure all the assistance, relief and protection operations required for victims of natural disasters or, on contrary, man-made crises, such as wars and outbreaks of fighting, or exceptional situations or circumstances comparable to natural or man-made disasters. It shall do so for the time needed to meet the humanitarian requirements resulting from these different situations.

The ECHO' core mandate¹ is to save and preserve life during emergencies and their immediate aftermath and natural disasters that have entailed major loss of life, physical, psychological or social suffering or material damage, Mr Spitz said.

¹ ECHO should focus on its "core mandate", i.e., life-saving operations in emergencies which aim for the earliest possible exit, combined with a co-ordinated and progressive transition from humanitarian aid to

“ECHO's core mandate is to fund the co-ordinated delivery of humanitarian assistance and protection through partner humanitarian organisations (NGOs, the UN specialised agencies, the Red Cross family) in order to save and preserve life, reduce suffering and safeguard the integrity and the dignity of the populations in third countries affected by humanitarian natural or man-made crises, with the final aim to facilitate their return to self-sufficiency. Beyond the direct response to humanitarian needs in crisis situations, ECHO works at reducing vulnerability in high risk natural disaster prone areas. ECHO's policy also aims at establishing, at international level, a more integrated and sustainable approach to the solution of crises of a complex nature”²

Mr Spitz has defined the role of the ECHO in the rehabilitation as being: to carry out short-term rehabilitation and reconstruction work, especially on infrastructure and equipment, in close association with local structures, with a view to facilitating the arrival of relief, preventing the impact of the crisis from worsening and starting to help those affected regain a minimum level of self-sufficiency, taking long-term development objectives into account where possible.

ECHO is therefore trying to solve the so-called “grey zone”³ dilemma.

The “grey zone” is the area of work which falls between relief operations and development programmes and created regular problems at field level and challenged the mandates of both short-term humanitarian and long-term development aid.

In this context, the ECHO’s extensive mandate allows for the provision of aid even after an emergency is over. In order to preserve gains ECHO needs to remain involved until rehabilitation donors engage. However, late engagement of rehab donors eats into humanitarian funds which are more needed for emergency assistance.

normal co-operation instruments. The main challenge is to identify the appropriate instruments that can take over from humanitarian assistance and to mobilise them in a timely fashion taking into account each instrument's funding cycle and limitations “COM (2001) 153 final Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development – An assessment”

² Poul Nielson European Commissioner for Development and Humanitarian Aid *“World Solidarity and Global Stability: The role of the EU Development Policy”* Prague University of Economics Prague, 11 November 2002

³ In the 1980s, both academics and practitioners voiced concern about the so-called “grey zone” between humanitarian assistance, rehabilitation and development (LRRD). This grey zone arises because humanitarian assistance differs from development co-operation programmes. The former addresses the immediate needs of individuals affected by crises and is provided mainly through non governmental and international organisations - COM (2001) 153 final

LRRD requires the elaboration of a comprehensive and integrated aid strategy covering short to medium to long term objectives. Each EC department should have its role clearly identified with a timeline for the phasing in and out of the different aid instruments.

The projects in the area of food security and the definition of the CSP can be a long process and then ECHO has a major interest in being implicated in the early stages of development of the CSPs to ensure that ECHO's experience/concerns are included in the analysis. It needs to be associated in the elaboration of the documents that set out development priorities.

In the context of LRRD a smooth phasing out of humanitarian aid and phasing in and rehabilitation and development aid is the ultimate target. But unfortunately, there is a main difference with the reality, Mr Spitz has underlined, we have to create and to improve the communication, in practice is not that easy, because the perfect cooperation is rarely happen in the real world. LRRD is too often developed in an ad hoc manner with 'reverse engineering' being used to show a 'design' process.

Another criticism spotlight was that LRRD still depends too much on the goodwill and personal networks of individuals and the 'culture' wall dividing the 'developers' from the 'humanitarians' has still to be broken down.

What is also very relevant to mention, the speaker said, is that there are different levels of centralisation amongst the Commission services, more concretely, AIDCO has a de-concentrated set-up, whereas ECHO work is very much Headquarter driven.

Moreover, the time consuming administrative procedures for DEV/AIDCO preventing the smooth handover of ECHO funded projects.

However the two different working systems are compatible and complementary and the division of work between ECHO and DEV/AIDCO in the management of food aid and food security operations will be a test for LRRD, he mentioned, considering that ECHO with its new Food Aid hat will cover emergency needs with a phased handover to DEV/AIDCO Food Security and development budgets.

In this circumstance, we can mention few success stories, such as Sierra Leone, Angola, Liberia in the 90's. Another successful case is also Niger, where the proper division of work between ECHO, DG DEV and AIDCO has given the possibility to define and implement a clear integrated strategy to try and ensure an appropriate Commission to the nutritional crisis in this country. This was

achievable by evidently outlining in the form of a joint note, the role, the intentions and responsibilities of each part involved.

ECHO activities

- **Short term** - will maintain nutritional support operations and assistance in the health and food security sectors. This will involve a commitment of at least 12 MEURO in 2006. In addition, ECHO also requested the allocation 2/3 MEURO for Niger through WFP from the 2006 Food Aid budget.
- **Medium term** - as a complementary operation, the DG DEV has matched ECHO's financial commitment euro for euro with the transfer of an additional 12 MEURO to the 'B' envelope from the EDF reserves. An 'order for services' is being sent to AIDCO to cover this. These funds are on top of the existing 3 MEURO support to the Niger Government's food security 'dispositif'. And on top of the 3 MEURO allocation from the Food Security budget line for NGO projects in 2006.
- **Long term** - we have to underline here a very important fact: DG DEV has undertaken to include food security and measures to combat rural poverty in the 10th EDF CSP for Niger covering the period from 2008 to 2013.

LLR-D EXAMPLES IN SOUTH SUDAN

Intervention of Mr Fernandez de Velasco Antonio - ECHO

He made a short presentation of the activities of ECHO in Sudan, especially in the South, giving three examples of LRR-D in this country: GAA, Oxfam and VSF.

More concretely, ECHO is supporting livestock and veterinary projects in South Sudan since mid 90s. He mentioned that some successful interventions with a focus on preservation of livelihoods through targeted actions in Upper Nile and Kordofan states were made.

In 2002, HPP has approved with EDF funds and this represented the start of discussions for possible "hand over". In early 2003, three had been identified and agreed, and all in the food security sector with a Commission instrument that could provide more stable and long term funding.

All the projects presented aimed to increase household food security and access to basic services for the vulnerable and low income rural and displaced households through community based approaches.

Making a comparative analysis between the ECHO and HPP projects, we can see an entire range of similarities, such as: establishment and strengthening of livestock community based organizations, para-veterinary training; Formation and stocking of “bush pharmacies” and also vaccination campaigns.

In parallel, we can note also the differences and to identify few: more long term funding (2 years, in some instances extended to 3); supporting cattle breeding and re-stocking; marketing of pastoral products ; lobbying and advocacy to improve market access for pastoralists; support to small income generating activities (poultry and honey production).

For these reasons, the HPP taking it one step further, the speaker said.

The challenges are various and not unimportant. We can mention here the examples of his presentation: unavoidable gaps between completion of ECHO funding and start of HPP (GAA: 16 months, Oxfam: 7 months), leading to a long process and loss of people, because severe financial restrictions, the problem of the ownership and use of assets and equipment, and also funding needed beyond HPP.